

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the present amendment and in view of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8 are pending in the present application. Claims 1 and 2 are amended and new claims 3-8 are added by the present amendment.

As an initial matter, Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledgment of Applicants' claim for priority, and for confirming receipt of the certified copy of the priority document, as noted in item 1 at page 2 of the outstanding Office Action, and for the acknowledgment that the drawings are acceptable, as noted in item 10(a) of the Office Action Summary.

Objection to the Abstract

In the outstanding Office Action, the Abstract was objected to for informalities. The Abstract is amended in light of the comments noted in the outstanding Office Action and to better conform to standard patent practice, and it is believed no new matter is added by the amendments to the Abstract.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested this objection be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite. Claims 1 and 2 are amended in light of the comments noted in the outstanding Office Action, and to better conform to standard claim drafting practice.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested this rejection also be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In the outstanding Office Action, claim 1 was rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as unpatentable over US Patent Number 6,629,716 to Shibata et al (herein "Shibata"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “a box housing” which has “a longitudinal guide groove formed at an upper surface of the box housing.” Claim 1 further recites “a stopper formed at an upper edge of an inside of the glove box and extending into the guide groove to be moved along the guide groove to limit open/close displacement of the glove box.”

In a non-limiting example, FIG. 5a of Applicants drawings shows “the guide groove 22 is formed at the upper surface of the box housing 20, and the stopper 40 is formed at the upper edge of the inside of the glove box 30 to be inserted into the guide groove 22” (see the specification at page 7, lines 12-14). Also, “As the glove box is opened, the stopper 40 is guided along the guide groove 22” (see the specification at page 7, lines 15 and 16).

Such a glove box can reduce the time for assembly and disassembly since the glove box can easily be removed at once (see the specification at page 8, lines 20-23).

In contrast, Shibata only discloses a “hooking portion 32” which is formed on a bottom inner surface of a “holder 20” (see col. 4, lines 56-58 of Shibata). It is respectfully submitted such a “hooking portion 32” is different from claim 1, which recites “a longitudinal guide groove formed at an upper surface of the box housing.”

Further, Shibata only discusses a “hook 33” (which the outstanding Office Action relates to the “stopper” recited in pending claim 1) which cannot move along the “hooking portion 32” (which the outstanding Office Action relates to the “groove guide” recited in claim 1). Assuming *arguendo* the “hook 33” and “hooking portion 32” of Shibata can be related to features of the pending claims, Shibata does not teach or suggest a “stopper ... inserted into the guide groove to be moved along the guide groove,” as recited in pending claim 1. In contrast to pending claim 1, in Shibata, the “hook 33” is immediately stopped from movement when it contacts the “hooking portion 32.”

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner’s rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is improper at least for the above reasons, and that independent claim 1 and each of the claims depending therefrom patentably distinguish over Shibata.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Shibata and US Patent Number 5,845,945 to DePue (herein “DePue”). Further, the outstanding Office Action takes Official Notice of equivalence between a torsion spring and a cantilevered plate spring. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 2 depends on independent claim 1, which as discussed above is believed to patentably distinguish over Shibata. Further, DePue merely discloses a glove box assembly including a pair of guide pins, but also does not discuss or suggest the features of independent claim 1 and claim 2 depending therefrom.

Moreover, the features recited in claim 2 (which depends on claim 1) even further patentably distinguish over Shibata and DePue, and a *prima facie* case for obviousness has not been made regarding substitution of a torsion spring for the cantilever plate spring discusses in Shibata.

In particular, it is respectfully submitted substituting a torsion spring for the cantilever plate spring discussed in Shibata would not have had a reasonable expectation of success, and would have violated a principle of operation of Shibata at least because the “shift arm 30” shown in FIG. 11 is enclosed in a small space within the “support 23,” and there is no room for a torsion spring assembly as recited in claim 2, for example.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner’s rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is improper for at least the above reasons, and that independent claim 1 and each of the claims depending therefrom patentably distinguish over Shibata and DePue.

New Claims

In addition, new claims 3-8 are added to set forth the invention with a varying scope. Support for new claim 3 is found in the originally filed specification at least at page 5, lines 7 and 8; support for new claim 4 is found at least at page 5, lines 9 and 10; support for new claim 5 is found at least at page 5, lines 17-19 and page 8, lines 2-4; support for new claim 6 is found at least at page 9, lines 1 and 2; support for new claim 7 is found at least at page 8, lines 12-14; and support for new claim 8 is found in the originally filed specification at least in FIG. 5a and page 5, lines 7 and 8.

New claims 3-8 are believed to patentably distinguish over the cited references at least for similar reasons as independent claim 1, as well as the additional patentable features recited in new claims 3-8.



Conclusion

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, consideration of the present Amendment, reconsideration of the outstanding Office Action, and allowance of the present application and all of the claims therein is respectfully requested.

The amendments to the claims which have been made in this amendment, have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based on the cited art, and should thus be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to have attached thereto.

Applicants have made a sincere effort to place the present application in condition for allowance and believe they have now done so.

If the Examiner has any questions concerning this Amendment or the present application, Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,
In-heum PARK et al.

Will E. Lynell Reg. No.
Bruce H. Bernstein 41,568
Reg. No. 29,027

October 25, 2004
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191